



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,163	01/30/2004	Manuel Eslick Plaza	6015P2687	7765

23504 7590 04/19/2007  
WEISS & MOY PC  
4204 NORTH BROWN AVENUE  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/19/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/769,163	PLAZA, MANUEL ESLICK	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Le Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Oath/Declaration*

1. Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18-20, 23, 24, 26 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable with *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") over Bates et al. ("Bates").

As per claim 1, although HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising detecting user activity within a main browser window of said browser, parsing the detected activity to determine a target of said detected activity to activate a secondary browser window and display content associated with the target in the secondary browser window (pages 94 and 356; *following the detected user clicking of a hyperlink, detecting a tag for activating*

*a secondary browser window and displaying content associated with the target in the secondary browser window via parsing), HTML does not explicitly disclose comparing the target to determine whether the target is in a list of pre-selected targets to displaying content associated with the target in the browser window. Bates teaches comparing the target to determine whether the target is in a list of pre-selected targets to displaying content associated with the target in the browser window (paragraphs [0129]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Bates with the method of HTML given that it may be desirable to view only sanctioned sites.*

As per claim 2, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising a second detecting wherein the second detecting is of a second user activity within the secondary browser window and responsive to the second detecting, transferring a locator associated with the second user activity to the primary browser window, whereby content associated with the second user activity is displayed in the primary browser window (HTML: pages 338 and 356; *i.e. by using the TARGET attribute specifying the name of the primary browser window in order to display content associated with the second user activity in the primary browser window wherein a second detection is made upon user's selection of another link*).

As per claim 4, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the detecting further detects an active locator of the primary browser window and wherein the parsing

determines the target from the user activity and the active locator (HTML: pages 338 and 356; *in order to display a URL content in the specified window, the HTML code is parsed whereby the target/specified window where content is to be displayed and the activated universal resource locator are detected*).

As per claim 6, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the target is a link containing a next locator for the primary browser window, and further comprising blocking the primary browser window from activating the next locator in response to a result of the comparing (Bates: paragraph [0131]).

As per claim 7, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the target is a link containing a next locator for the primary browser window, and wherein the displaying displays content associated with the next locator (HTML: pages 338 and 356; Bates: fig. 23; *content is displayed for each locator*).

As per claims 8 and 9, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising transmitting a result of the comparing to a server and pushing content from the server in response to reception of said result of the comparing wherein the displaying displays the pushed content and transmitting a result of the parsing to a server and pushing content from the server in response to reception of said result of the parsing wherein the displaying displays the pushed content (HTML: pages 338 and 356; Bates: fig. 23; paragraph

[0080]; *i.e. described are standard Web browser interactions with a remote Web server*).

Claims 12 and 23 individually are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13 and 24 individually are similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15 and 26 individually are similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17 and 28 individually are similar in scope to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 29 individually are similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 19 and 20, in combination, are similar to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 30 and 31, in combination, are similar to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 3, 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable with *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") over Bates et al. ("Bates") as applied to claims 2, 13 and 24, and further in view of Best et al. ("Best").

As per claim 3, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising in response to detecting a second user activity corresponding to a second target for which all

responsive content is targeted for display in the primary browser window (HTML: pages 338 and 356; *i.e. by using the TARGET attribute specifying the name of the primary browser window in order to display content associated with the second user activity in the primary browser window*) and hiding the secondary browser window in response to having detected a user activity (HTML: figs. 12.1 and 12.15; Bates: fig. 23; *via selection of close "X" icon located in upper right hand corner of each frame/window*), the modified HTML does not explicitly disclose hiding a window in response to having detected a user activity corresponding to a target for which all responsive content is targeted for display in a browser window. Best teaches hiding a window in response to having detected a user activity corresponding to a target for which all responsive content is targeted for display in a browser window (paragraphs [0033]-[0034]; *upon selection of URL 405 in window 431, window 431 closes and all responsive content is displayed in a browser as indicated in block 531*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Best with the method of the modified HTML in order to emphasize the area of focus and provide a less cluttered viewing area.

Claims 14 and 25 individually are similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 5, 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable with *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") over Bates et al. ("Bates") as applied to claims 4, 15 and 26, and further in view of Vance, Jr. et al. ("Vance").

As per claim 5, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system wherein the active locator is a universal resource locator, the user activity comprises selection of the URL wherein the target is the content associated with the URL and wherein the displaying displays content associated with the URL (HTML: figs. 12.1 and 12.15; pages 338 and 356; Bates: fig. 23), the modified HTML does not explicitly disclose the locator to be a search engine, a user activity comprising entry of a search engine key wherein the user activity is parsed to determine a target of the detected activity wherein the target is a search engine result of the search engine for the search engine key whereby content associated with the search engine key is displayed. Vance teaches a locator to be a search engine, a user activity comprising entry of a search engine key wherein the user activity is parsed to determine a target of the detected activity wherein the target is a search engine result of the search engine for the search engine key whereby content associated with the search engine key is displayed (col. 2, lines 53-56; col. 3, lines 42-47; *the locator is a search engine key/search key entered in a search engine or search field wherein user activity is parsed to determine a target or search result for the search engine key for display of content associated with the search key*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Vance with the method of the modified HTML in order to find a particular topic of interest among the vast resources available over the Internet and save time.

Claims 16 and 27 individually are similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.



6. Claims 10, 11, 21, 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable with *Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in a Week* ("HTML") over Bates et al. ("Bates"), and further in view of Ryan et al. ("Ryan").

As per claim 10, although the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising a second detecting wherein the second detecting is of a second user activity within the secondary browser window and responsive to the second detecting, transferring a locator associated with the second user activity to the primary browser window and wherein the displaying displays content associated with the target in the secondary browser window (HTML: pages 338 and 356; *i.e. a second detection is made upon user's activity/selection of another link and using the TARGET attribute specifies the name of the browser window wherein content associated with the second user selection is to be displayed*), the modified HTML does not explicitly disclose a second detecting wherein the second detecting is of a geographical location associated with a user of the general-purpose computer system and wherein the displaying displays content filtered by the geographical location. Ryan teaches a second detecting wherein the second detecting is of a geographical location associated with a user of the general-purpose computer system (fig. 12(A); paragraph [0097]; *users are prompted to enter a zip code or city*), and wherein the displaying displays content associated with the target and filtered by the geographical location in a secondary window (figs. 12(A-B); paragraphs [0108], [0072] and [0096]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention

to incorporate the method of Ryan with the method of the modified HTML in order to provide information that is of a geographical division of interest to the user.

As per claim 11, the modified HTML teaches a method of operating a browser executing within a general-purpose computer system comprising transmitting a result of the parsing to a server along with an indication of the geographical location, selecting content in conformity with the geographical location and the result of the parsing, and pushing the selected content from the server, whereby the displaying displays the pushed content selected in conformity with the geographical location (Ryan: paragraph [0133]).

Claims 21 and 32 individually are similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Makinen (US 2003/0098893) teaches the search results may also be displayed in a pop-up window.

Cole et al. (US 2003/0078811 A1) teach displaying search results in a second window.

Khosla et al. (US 6,202,061 B1) teach a window 851 of fig. 10A which may be used to define the search criteria wherein the search engine performs the search and displays the search result in window 1101 of fig. 11.

***Inquires***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lvn  
Patent Examiner  
April 6, 2007

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100